

Archives
Closed
LD
175
A40k
TH
202

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PRACTICE
OF MAINSTREAMING

A Thesis
by
PAULA LAVENDAR NORTON

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST

July 1981

Major Department: Special Education

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PRACTICE
OF MAINSTREAMING

A Thesis

by

Paula Lavendar Norton

July 1981

APPROVED BY:

James B. Gray Jr.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Linda L. Blaxton
Member, Thesis Committee

B. F. Strickland
Member, Thesis Committee

James B. Gray Jr.
Chairperson, Department of

Special Education

Joyce V. Lawrence
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PRACTICE
OF MAINSTREAMING

Paula Lavendar Norton, BA, Columbus College
MAEd, Western Carolina University
EdS, Appalachian State University
Thesis Chairperson: James B. Gray

This study was conducted to determine, according to grade level assignment, the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward the practice of mainstreaming. An attitudinal scale was administered to all regular classroom teachers in the McDowell County School System in Marion, North Carolina. Eight variables were selected to test for correlations with attitude: grade level assignment, sex, marital status, age, years of teaching experience, degrees earned, mainstreaming courses/workshops taken, and presence of a handicapped relative.

Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for the groups for each of the eight variables. The attitudinal statements were analyzed in relation to the test variables. The F-test, correlation coefficient, and eta correlation were calculated to determine significance at the .05 level. The reliability of the attitudinal questionnaire was tested with covariance and correlation

matrices for the alpha reliability coefficient. The data revealed low mean attitudinal scores. No correlations were found between attitudes and the eight test variables. There was no statistically significant difference between the scores.

It can be concluded that McDowell County regular classroom teachers have negative attitudes toward mainstreaming. It appears that these attitudes could likely be redirected through meaningful in-service training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Chapters	
I. Introduction	1
Review of Literature	2
Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming	2
Variables Related to Attitudes	4
Attempts to Influence Attitudes	6
Statement of Problem	8
Hypotheses	8
II. Method	
Subjects	9
Apparatus	12
Design	13
Procedure	14
III. Results	15
IV. Discussion, Recommendations for Practice and	
Further Research, and Summary	20-22
Glossary	25
Bibliography	27
Appendices	34-39
Vita	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Description of Sample	10
2. Mean Attitude Scores	16
3. Analysis of Variance	19

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In the last decade there has been an increasing national movement in public education away from self-contained classes as the primary service option for special-needs students. During the transitional stage, exceptional children were gradually placed back into regular classrooms. As with the civil rights movement in the sixties, the "separate but equal" doctrine became unacceptable for special education in the seventies. The flow of handicapped children from segregated special classes to regular education classes was appropriately termed "mainstreaming."

The passage of Public Law 94-142 by Congress in 1975 and the subsequent publication of rules and regulations by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in August 1977 mandated an appropriate education in the least restrictive environment for all handicapped children. In practice the mandate relegated severely handicapped students to self-contained classes. The resource room, combined with mainstreaming, became the new special education delivery model for the majority of exceptional children. Thus regular classroom teachers were faced with the task of teaching handicapped children along with regular students. Because the responsibility for

the education of handicapped students is shared by regular classroom teachers, their needs and attitudes deserve investigation.

Review of Literature

Attitudes toward mainstreaming. A review of related literature reveals that the success of mainstreaming is dependent upon the attitudes of regular classroom teachers. Even though mainstreaming involves the combined efforts of the resource teacher and the regular classroom teacher, it is generally the regular teacher who serves the exceptional child for the largest portion of the school day. Thus, the attitudes of regular classroom teachers are extremely important.

...for any given child being mainstreamed "the luck of the draw" in teachers they get for regular class may determine their educational plight (MacMillan, Jones, & Meyers, 1976, p. 5).

Most researchers agree that regular classroom teachers are unprepared to teach handicapped students. Many universities have not recognized teachers' needs for courses about exceptional children. Teachers who have had inadequate or no training in mainstreaming are being forced to integrate handicapped children into their classrooms. Furthermore, many teachers are supervised infrequently and are not getting the support that they need from administrators (Heron, 1978).

Many studies have shown that regular classroom teachers have negative attitudes towards the practice of mainstreaming. Gickling and

Theobald (1975) found that 60% of regular and special teachers and supervisor/administrators were unfavorable toward mainstreaming. Seventy-two percent of the secondary teachers and 58% of the elementary teachers felt that self-contained classes were more effective than regular classes for mildly handicapped students.

Hewett and Watson (1975) found that teachers do not feel confident in meeting the needs of exceptional children. Flynn, Gacka, & Sundean (1978) reported that 53% of the elementary teachers and 58% of the secondary teachers in their study felt inadequately prepared to meet the needs of mainstreamed students.

Specific examples of teacher negativism toward handicapped students are illustrated in numerous studies. Palmer (1979) found that teachers gave different instructional prescriptions for handicapped and regular students with similar abilities. Further, Palmer reported that even though handicapped students were placed in regular classes, "instructional segregation" was being practiced.

Chapman, Larsen, & Palmer (1979) reported that teachers are critical and negative to handicapped students even when they exhibit behaviors accepted in regular students. Similar findings were reported by Horne. In a 1979 study, she demonstrated that handicapped students have an overall lower status in society.

Berryman, Neal, & Robinson (1980) found that teacher attitudes can adversely or positively affect student achievement and behavior. Attitudes and expectations that are allowed to become self-fulfilling

prophecies produce the very behavior expected in handicapped children.

Several studies have produced evidence that teachers' attitudes vary in relation to the label given to the handicapped child. Guerin (1979) found that teachers were less comfortable with educable mentally handicapped (EMH) students than with other exceptional students. Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan (1972) found that teachers preferred learning disabled students to emotionally handicapped students, but felt least favorable toward EMH students.

Variables related to attitudes. Numerous researchers have investigated the causes of teachers' negative attitudes toward mainstreaming. The following factors have been found to have positive correlation with negative attitudes:

- 1) being unmarried (Smart, Wilton, & Keeling, 1980).
- 2) lacking self-confidence (Stephens & Braun, 1980).
- 3) low tolerance levels (MacMillan et al., 1976).
- 4) teacher perception of degree of success (Larrivee & Cook, 1979).
- 5) wholesale mainstreaming (Heron, 1978).

Let us continue to provide the shallow pools for the children who cannot swim as we modify the mainstream for those trying to swim. Too many children are in deep water (Diamond, 1977, p. 250).

- 6) no participation in the decision-making process (Powers, 1979).

- 7) personal failure in past experiences with handicapped children (Powers, 1979).
- 8) inadequate support services (Graham, Burdg, & Hudson, 1980).
- 9) insufficient time for planning (Graham et al., 1980).
- 10) lack of administrative support (Larrivee & Cook, 1979).
- 11) lack of exceptional children coursework (Stephens & Braun, 1980).
- 12) age of teacher (Harasysmiw & Horne, 1975).
- 13) communication difficulties (Gickling & Theobald, 1975).
- 14) a negative attitude on the part of the resource teacher in the school (Guerin & Szatlocky, 1974).

Larrivee and Cook (1979) administered an attitudinal scale to a random sample of approximately 1,000 K-12 public school teachers in the six New England states. The data revealed that teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming became less positive as grade level increased. Kindergarten teachers were found to have the most positive attitudes of the teachers sampled. However, junior high school teachers, specifically grades 7-8, exhibited more negative attitudes than high school teachers. Larrivee and Cook found no correlation with attitude for the following variables: type of community (urban, rural, suburban), classroom size and school size, and the type of school. The regular classroom teacher's perception of degree of success in dealing with special-needs students had the most significant relationship to teacher attitude.

Stephens and Braun (1980) support the evidence reported by Larivee and Cook that grade level assignment is related to teacher attitude. Questionnaires were administered to approximately 1,000 K-8 teachers in Illinois that explored teachers' willingness to accept exceptional students into their classrooms. Their analysis revealed that primary and intermediate teachers were more willing to integrate handicapped students than were teachers of grades 7 and 8. Stephens and Braun concluded that as subject matter becomes more important, teachers become less accepting of individual differences.

Attempts to influence attitudes. Many believe that training in special education encourages positive attitudes in regular classroom teachers. Smith and Schindler (1980) recommended that states begin to require preservice teachers to take a minimum of two 3-hour courses: Characteristics of Exceptional Learners, and Methods of Effectively Teaching Exceptional Pupils. Harasymiw and Horne (1976) suggested in-service workshops to provide teachers with both knowledge about handicapped students plus classroom experiences in working with them. Harasymiw and Horne have found that the success of in-service workshops depends upon the support of administrators and resource personnel.

Stephens & Braun (1980) administered a questionnaire concerning teacher training, prior experiences with exceptional children, and their attitudes toward such children. The data revealed that the teachers who had taken courses in special education were more willing to accept handicapped students into their classes than were those who had not taken such courses.

Carberry, Waxman, & McKain (1981) developed a successful in-service workshop model for regular classroom teachers. They reported that a good workshop should be small (no more than ten participants), practical, specific, informal, and deal with a topic that meets the teachers' needs, not the needs of the administration.

Boyd & Jiggets (1977) proposed a six-weeks workshop for regular and resource teachers which would focus on the skills, competencies, and attitudes needed by teachers to promote and facilitate the learning experience of all children, not just handicapped children. After completion of the workshop, the teachers would take turns switching teaching positions. During a one-year period, the teachers would meet weekly for one hour after school to discuss and share their on-the-job experiences and problems, and to receive consultation. A program such as this would give insight to regular and special teachers, as well as improve communication and coordination.

Heron (1978) stated that most teachers would make positive changes in teaching behaviors if constructive feedback was communicated to them. In 1979 Horne reported that training programs must be relevant and yield observable success for the teachers.

Attention has been placed more frequently on the needs of the exceptional child, not the needs of the regular classroom teacher (Guerin, 1979). Gickling and Theobald (1975) stressed that the concept of individualization must also apply to teachers because

not all teachers are equally willing to mainstream handicapped students. Research strongly indicates that attention must be given to regular classroom teachers if mainstreaming is to succeed.

In summary, there is substantial research to support the contention that regular classroom teachers generally have negative attitudes toward the practice of mainstreaming. Several studies have indicated correlations between attitudes and variables such as self-concept, perception of success, training, and grade level assignment. No variable has been correlated consistently with teacher attitudes. Teacher attitudes and programs to improve attitudes should be further investigated. The research reported in this thesis examined the effect of eight variables on the attitudes of regular classroom teachers.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine, according to grade level assignment, the attitudes of regular classroom teachers in McDowell County toward the practice of mainstreaming.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study were:

- 1) The overall mean scores on the attitudinal scale will be low and negative for McDowell County teachers of grades K-12.
- 2) As grade level assignment increases, the McDowell County teachers' scores on the attitudinal scale will decrease significantly.

CHAPTER II

Method

Subjects

The subjects were regular classroom teachers employed by the McDowell County School System in Marion, North Carolina. Principals, special education teachers, remedial reading and math teachers, librarians, and counselors were excluded from this survey. The total group included 84 K-3 teachers, 58 4-6 teachers, 72 7-9 teachers, and 77 10-12 teachers. The return rate of the survey was 77%. Questionnaires were returned by 83 K-3 teachers, 43 4-6 teachers, 60 7-9 teachers, and 39 10-12 teachers.

The typical subject was a married female over 30 years of age. She had a bachelor's degree and at least seven years teaching experience, but had taken two or less mainstreaming courses/workshops (see Table 1).

McDowell County is located in the foothills of western North Carolina between Burke, Rutherford, and Buncombe Counties. The school system includes eight elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one senior high school. Each school has from one to four special education teachers who typically deliver services in resource rooms.

Table 1
Description of Sample

<u>Test Variable Group</u>	<u>Percent^a</u>
Grade Level Assignment	
K-3	36.9
4-6	20.0
7-9	27.6
10-12	15.6
Sex	
Male	19.1
Female	80.9
Marital Status	
Married	76.4
Single	14.7
Separated/Divorced	8.4
Age	
20-25	9.8
26-30	29.3
31-40	32.9
41-50	16.0
Over 50	12.0

Table 1 (continued)
Description of Sample

<u>Test Variable Group</u>	<u>Percent^a</u>
Years Teaching Experience	
0-3	13.8
4-6	20.9
7-10	20.0
11-15	22.2
Over 16	22.7
Last Degree Earned	
BA/BS	74.2
MA/MS	23.1
EdS	1.8
PhD/EdD	0
Mainstreaming Courses/Workshops	
None	37.8
1-2	37.8
3-4	14.7
5-6	2.7
Over 6	4.4
Have Handicapped Relative	
Yes	37.8
No	61.3

^aMissing data account for any deviations from 100%.

Apparatus

Data were gathered using an attitudinal scale developed by Larrivee and Cook (1979). The scale was constructed by the Likert method of summated ratings. In using the scale, respondents indicate the extent of their agreement with each statement using a 5-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale was developed for use in examining the effects of variables on the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward the practice of mainstreaming. Larrivee and Cook did an item analysis on the 41-item scale, and the 30 items with the highest scale correlation coefficients were chosen to form the final scale. The split-half reliability of the scale, as determined by the Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient, was found by Larrivee and Cook to be .92. For this study, the 30-item attitudinal scale was not altered.

The eight variables selected for examination of effects on teacher attitude toward the practice of mainstreaming were:

- 1) Grade level assignment
- 2) Sex
- 3) Marital status
- 4) Age
- 5) Years teaching experience
- 6) Last degree earned
- 7) Mainstreaming courses/workshops taken
- 8) Having a handicapped relative

The 38-item attitudinal scale used in this study is referred to as the attitudinal questionnaire.

Each of the subjects received an attitudinal questionnaire and a one-page directions sheet. Copies of both are appended.

Design

The independent variable was the attitudinal questionnaire. The dependent variables were the eight test variables' effects on the attitudinal scores.

Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for the groups for each of the eight test variables. The statements (attitudinal questionnaire items 9-38) were analyzed in relation to the test variables (items 1-8).

The F-test, correlation coefficient, and eta correlation were calculated to determine significance at the .05 level. The F-test is used in analysis of data to discover which of several factors affect a process. The correlation coefficient reflects the amount of shared variance that can be accounted for between two variables, whether the data are linear or not. The correlation ratio, or eta correlation, is used when the relationship between two sets of data are curvilinear.

The reliability of the attitudinal questionnaire was tested with covariance and correlation matrices for the alpha reliability coefficient.

Procedure

With approval from the Superintendent of McDowell County Schools, the attitudinal questionnaire was presented at the May 20, 1981 county-wide principals' meeting. Each of the 11 principals gave the questionnaires and directions sheets to his teachers during a faculty meeting. Within two weeks, the principals returned the completed questionnaires to the author. The return rate was 77%.

CHAPTER III

Results

Examination of the data indicated that the regular classroom teachers in McDowell County do not have overall positive attitudes toward mainstreaming. The group mean attitude score was 84.06 with a standard deviation of 7.25 (see Table 2). High mean values are representative of a positive attitude, with 150 being the highest attainable score, and 30 being the lowest possible.

Sixty-seven percent of the teachers sampled agreed that the needs of handicapped students can best be served through special, separate classes. Sixty-nine percent agreed that the special-needs child will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.

Eighty-one percent agreed that a special-needs child's classroom behavior generally requires more patience from the teacher than does the behavior of a normal child. Seventy percent agreed that diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is better done by resource room or special teachers than by regular classroom teachers. Sixty-one percent agreed that integration of special-needs children will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures.

Table 2.

Mean Attitude Scores

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Entire Population	84.06	7.25	218 ^a
Grade Level Assignment			
K-3	84.66	7.41	82
4-6	82.78	6.88	41
7-9	84.62	6.63	60
10-12	83.23	8.31	35
Sex			
Male	85.69	6.40	42
Female	83.68	7.41	176
Marital Status			
Married	84.01	7.22	165
Single	83.97	6.71	33
Separated/Divorced	84.37	8.75	19
Age			
20-25	80.55	7.10	22
26-30	85.00	6.27	65
31-40	85.21	8.41	72
41-50	83.09	6.71	35
Over 50	82.75	5.88	24

Table 2. (continued)

Mean Attitude Scores

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Years Teaching Experience			
0-3	82.61	8.04	31
4-6	85.43	7.87	46
7-10	84.95	7.44	44
11-15	83.56	6.83	48
Over 16	83.48	6.32	48
Last Degree Earned			
BA/BS	83.94	7.48	160
MA/MS	85.00	6.47	52
ED.S	81.50	7.00	4
Mainstreaming Courses/Workshops			
None	83.49	8.43	83
1-2	84.06	6.71	81
3-4	83.64	6.03	33
5-6	87.50	4.85	6
Over 6	88.11	6.41	9
Have Handicapped Relative			
Yes	83.89	7.13	82
No	84.19	7.35	134

^aMissing data account for any deviations from total n of 218.

Sixty-nine percent disagreed that regular classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach children with special needs. Seventy-six percent of the teachers sampled had taken two, one, or no workshops pertaining to mainstreaming.

On the positive side, the data indicated that seventy-five percent agreed that many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for special-needs students. Sixty percent agreed that special-needs students should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom setting, where possible. Fifty-seven percent agreed that the presence of special-needs students will promote the acceptance of differences on the part of regular students.

Between and within group variance was analyzed for each of the eight test variables. The F-test revealed no significant differences for grade level assignment, sex, marital status, age, years of teaching experience, degrees earned, mainstreaming courses/workshops taken, or having a handicapped relative in relation to attitude scores. Linear correlation and eta correlation also revealed no significant statistical differences (see Table 3).

Table 3.

Analysis of Variance

	<u>Sum of Sq.</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>Mean Sq.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>eta</u>
Grade Level Assignment	139.28	3	46.43	.88	.45	.11
Sex	137.59	1	137.59	2.64	-	.11
Marital Status	2.39	2	1.20	.02	.01	.01
Age	498.53	4	124.63	2.43	.002	.21
Years Teaching Experience	214.98	4	53.74	1.02	.03	.14
Last Degree Earned	72.88	2	36.44	.70	.03	.08
Mainstreaming Courses/ Workshops	251.15	4	62.79	1.18	.12	.15
Having Handicapped Relative	4.47	1	4.47	.09	-	.02

The alpha reliability coefficient for the attitudinal scale is .50. If the scale is reconstructed so that the undecided response receives 0-points instead of three, the reliability coefficient increases to .79.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion, Recommendations For Practice and Further Research and Summary

Discussion

The regular classroom teachers in this survey had a mean attitude score of 84 out of a possible 150 which indicates a negative attitude toward mainstreaming. This is eight points lower than the mean score reported by Larrivee and Cook in their 1979 study of teacher attitudes.

Even though the McDowell County regular classroom teachers are generally negative in attitudes toward mainstreaming, they tended to express few strong opinions. Twenty-seven percent of the total responses to the questionnaire statements were undecided, with very few teachers expressing strong agreement or disagreement. Only seven teachers out of the entire sample had no undecided responses. This is similar to Gickling and Theobald's findings in 1975 that teachers are undecided about the prospects of mainstreaming.

This study is in agreement with the literature concerning regular classroom teachers' negative attitudes toward mainstreaming. As Heron reported in 1978, the McDowell County teachers feel inadequately trained to mainstream handicapped students successfully. A majority of the McDowell County teachers prefer self-contained classes for mildly handicapped students, as Gickling and Theobald reported in 1975.

A major problem of this study was the sample. The sample was intentionally drawn from one school system to pinpoint local in-service needs. However, the result was a relatively small group of teachers with highly similar attitudes that showed no correlations with any of the test variables.

Recommendations For Practice and Further Research

The McDowell County School System should strongly consider an in-service training program for their regular classroom teachers and resource teachers. Since mainstreaming involves the combined efforts of regular and resource teachers, both should be involved in the training program. Boyd and Jiggets recommended this in a 1977 report. Relevant training workshops, such as those recommended by Horne (1979), plus support from administrative and supervisory personnel, might help raise competence and confidence levels of regular classroom teachers. Positive results would be likely since the McDowell County teachers already exhibit a willingness to integrate handicapped students into their classrooms.

Recommendations for further research would include the use or construction of more reliable attitudinal scales. As it is, the 5-point rating scale has the undecided response in the middle. It is recommended to move the undecided response to the last choice on the right. This might discourage teachers from consistently choosing the undecided response.

A random sample selected from across the state should be considered for further research. If the researcher's goal is to show

a correlation between attitudes and a selected variable, a random sample from a wide variety of school systems is preferable.

The results of this study may have been affected by a lack of seriousness on the part of the respondents. This could be remedied by the researcher administering the attitudinal questionnaires personally at individual faculty meetings instead of relying on principals who are overly burdened with other responsibilities.

Summary

This study was conducted to determine, according to grade level assignment, the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward the practice of mainstreaming. After reviewing related literature, two hypotheses were formulated:

- 1) The overall mean scores on the attitudinal scale will be low and negative for McDowell County teachers of grades K-12.
- 2) As grade level assignment increases, the McDowell County teachers' scores on the attitudinal scale will decrease significantly.

An attitudinal scale was administered to all regular classroom teachers in the McDowell County School System in Marion, North Carolina. Eight variables were selected to test for correlations with attitude: grade level assignment, sex, marital status, age, years teaching experience, degrees earned, mainstreaming courses/workshops taken, and having a handicapped relative.

Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for the groups for each of the eight variables. The statements (attitudinal

questionnaire items 9-38) were analyzed in relation to the test variables (items 1-8). The F-test, correlation coefficient, and eta correlation were calculated to determine significance at the .05 level. The reliability of the attitudinal questionnaire was tested with covariance and correlation matrices for the alpha reliability coefficient.

The data revealed low mean attitudinal scores, so the first hypothesis was accepted. No correlations were found between attitudes and the eight test variables. Since there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of K-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12 teachers, the second hypothesis was rejected.

It can be concluded that McDowell County regular classroom teachers surveyed using the attitudinal questionnaire have negative attitudes toward the practice of mainstreaming. It appears that these attitudes could likely be redirected through meaningful in-service training.

Conclusions reported in this study cannot be generalized to all regular classroom teachers. The scope of the study was narrowed intentionally to include only McDowell County regular classroom teachers of grades K-12. Thus, the results and conclusions apply specifically to that select group of teachers.

GLOSSARY

Glossary

The following terms used in this study are defined for clarity and information:

Exceptional students are students who have been identified through due process of law as educable mentally retarded (EMH), learning disabled (LD), or emotionally handicapped (EH) and placed in part-time special classes.

Handicapped students is used interchangeably with the term exceptional students.

Special-needs students is used interchangeably with the term exceptional students.

Mainstreaming is the practice of placing exceptional students in regular curriculum courses for a portion of the school day.

Regular classroom teachers are teachers certified to teach in the elementary or secondary grades.

Resource classrooms are part-time special classes that are governed by the rules and regulations of the N.C. Department of Public Instruction, Division for Exceptional Children. They serve EMH, LD, and EH students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Administration of mainstreaming: The best of ERIC on educational management. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1980, 49.
- Antonak, R.F. "A heirarchy of attitudes toward exceptionality." The Journal of Special Education, 1980, 14, 231-241.
- Aufall, D.L. "The exceptional person: Approaches to integration." Readings in Mainstreaming, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1977, 16-18.
- Berryman, J.D.; Neal, W.R. & Robinson, J.E. "The validation of a scale to measure attitudes toward the classroom integration of disabled students." The Journal of Educational Research, 1980, 73, 199-203.
- Blatt, B. "A drastically different analysis." Mental Retardation, 1979, 17, 303-306.
- Boyd, F. & Jiggets, J. "Mainstreaming of special and regular education teachers through in-service workshops." Education, 1977, 98, 165-167.
- Brant, L. Attitudinal barriers to responsive vocational education for handicapped students. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1979. (ERIC Document No. ED 174815)
- Carberry, H., Waxman, B. & McKain, D. "An in-service workshop model for regular class teachers concerning mainstreaming of the learning disabled child." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, 26-28.
- Carpenter, W. "Wanted: Special teachers for special education." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, 102.
- Chapman, R.B., Larsen, S.C. & Parker, R.M. "Interactions of first grade teachers with learning disordered children." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1979, 12, 225-230.
- Childs, R.E. "A drastic change in curriculum for the educable mentally retarded child." Mental Retardation, 1979, 17, 299-300.
- Childs, R.E. "Rebuttal." Mental Retardation, 1979, 17, 306.
- Cole, H.P. Growth of attitudes, knowledge, and skill required by P.L. 94-142 among pre-service teachers. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1978. (ERIC Document No. ED 161845)

- Conine, T.A. "Acceptance or rejection of disabled persons by teachers." The Journal of School Health, 1969, 39, 278-281.
- Cronk, M.S. Mainstreaming in reverse. Stirling, Scotland: World Congress on Future Special Education, 1978. (ERIC Document No. ED 158509)
- Deno, E.N. Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Minnesota: Leadership Training Institute for Special Education, 1974.
- Diamond, B. "Myths of mainstreaming." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1979, 12, 246-250.
- Dodd, J. "Mainstreaming." The English Journal, 1980, 69, 51-55.
- Flynn, J.R., Gacka, R.C. & Sundean, D.A. "Are classroom teachers prepared for mainstreaming?" Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 562.
- Frith, G.H. & Mitchell, J.W. "The attitudes of non-handicapped students toward the mildly retarded: A consideration in placement decisions." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1981, 16, 79-83.
- Gickling, E. & Theobald, J.R. "Mainstreaming: Affect or effect." Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9 (3), 317-328.
- Glick, H.M. & Schubert, M. "Mainstreaming: An unmandated challenge." Educational Leadership, 1981, 38, 326-329.
- Gottlieb, J. & Sipperstein, G.N. "Attitudes toward mentally retarded persons: Effects of attitude referent specificity." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1976, 80, 376-381.
- Graham, S., Burdick, N., Hudson, F. & Carpenter, D. "Educational personnel's perceptions of mainstreaming and resource room effectiveness." Psychology in the Schools, 1980, 17, 128-134.
- Graubard, P. & Rosenberg, H. Classrooms that work. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1974.
- Guerin, G.R. "Regular teacher concerns with mainstreamed learning handicapped children." Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16, 543-545.
- Guerin, G.R. & Szatlocky, K. "Integration programs for the mildly retarded." Readings in Mainstreaming, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1977, 119-124.

- Hanley, M.R. "Adrift in the mainstream"? The Exceptional Parent, 1979, 9, E3-E6.
- Harasysmiw, S. & Horne, M. "Integration of handicapped children: Its effect on teacher attitudes." Education, 1975, 96, 153-158.
- Harasysmiw, S. & Horne, M. "Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children and regular class integration." The Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 393-400.
- Haring, N.G. & Krug, D. "Placement in regular programs: procedures and results." Readings in Mainstreaming, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1977, 60-62.
- Hawkins-Shepard, C. Making it work: practical ideas for integrating exceptional children into regular classes. Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.
- Heron, T. "Maintaining the mainstreamed child in the regular classroom: The decision-making process." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1978, 11, 26-32.
- Hewett, F.M. & Forness, S.R. Education of exceptional learners. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1977.
- Hewett, F.M. & Watson, P.C. Teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming: A preliminary report. Technical Report, University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.
- Horne, M.D. "Attitudes and mainstreaming: A literature review for school psychologists." Psychology in the Schools, 1977, 16, 61-67.
- Hudson, F. & others. "Mainstreaming: An examination of the attitudes and needs of regular classroom teachers." Learning Disability Quarterly, 1979, 2, 58-62.
- Johnson, A.B. & Cartwright, C.A. "The roles of information and experience in improving teachers' knowledge and attitudes about mainstreaming." The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13, 453-462.
- Jones, R.L. (Ed.). Mainstreaming and the minority child. Minneapolis: Leadership Training Institute for Special Education, 1976.
- Jordan, J.B. "Teacher, please don't close the door." Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.
- Kavanagh, E. "A classroom teacher looks at mainstreaming." Elementary School Journal, 1977, 77, 318-322.

- Kokoszka, R. & Drye, J. "Toward the least restrictive environment: High school LD students." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, 22; 23-26.
- Larrivee, B. & Cook, L. "Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude." The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 3, 315-324.
- Lawrence, E. & Winschel, J. "Locus of control: implications for special education." Exceptional Children, 1975, 41, 483-490.
- Lieberman, L.M. "Guest editorial: Mainstreaming for the eighties." Academic Therapy, 1980, 16, 111-114.
- MacMillan, D.L. "Regular class teachers' perceptions of transition programs for EMR students and their impact on the students." Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 99-103.
- MacMillan, D.L., Jones, R.L. & Meyers, C.E. "Mainstreaming the mildly retarded: Some questions, cautions and guidelines." Mental Retardation, 1976, 14, 3-10.
- Martin, M.J. "Mainstreaming and teaching in the public high school." The English Journal, 1980, 69, 9-11.
- McGinty, A.M. & Keogh, B.K. Needs assessment for in-service training: A first step for mainstreaming exceptional children into regular education. Technical Report, University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.
- Milbauer, B. The mainstreaming puzzle. Readings in Mainstreaming, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1978, 4-6.
- Neff, H. & Pilch, J. Teaching handicapped children easily. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1976.
- Palmer, D.J. "Regular-classroom teachers' attributions and instructional prescriptions for handicapped pupils." The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13, 325-327.
- Paul, J.L. & Warnock, N.J. "Special education: A changing field." The Exceptional Child, 1980, 27, 3-28.
- Pecheone, R.L. & Gable, R.K. The identification of in-service training needs and their relationship to teacher demographic characteristics, attitude toward, and knowledge of mildly handicapped children. Storrs, Connecticut: Connecticut University, 1978. (ERIC Document No. ED 156628)

- Powers, D.A. "Mainstreaming EMR pupils at the secondary level: A consideration of the issues." The High School Journal, 1979, 63, 102-113.
- Rauth, M. "Mainstreaming: A river to nowhere or a promising current?" Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers/AFL-CIO, 1978. (ERIC Document No. ED 162976)
- Richey, D.D., Miller, M. & Lessman, J. "Resource and regular classroom behavior of learning disabled students." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, 163-166.
- Ringlaben, R.P. & Price, J.R. "Regular classroom teachers' perceptions of mainstreaming effects." Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 302-304.
- Roubinek, D. "Will mainstreaming fit?" Educational Leadership, 1978, 41, 483-490.
- Rumble, R.R. A survey of the attitudes of secondary vocational cluster teachers toward the mainstreaming of handicapped learners. Portland, Oregon: Portland Public Schools, 1978. (ERIC Document No. ED 162478)
- Schifani, J.W., Anderson, R.M. & Odle, S.J. (Eds.) Implementing learning in the least restrictive environment: Handicapped children in the mainstream. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1980.
- Shotel, J., Iano, R. & McGettigan, J. "Teacher attitudes associated with the integration of handicapped children." Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 677-683.
- Siperstein, G.N. & Gottlieb, J. "Parents' and teachers' attitudes toward mildly and severely retarded children." Mental Retardation, 1978, 16, 321-322.
- Smart, R., Wilton, K. & Keeling, B. "Teacher factors and special class placement." The Journal of Special Education, 1980, 14, 217-229.
- Smith, J.E. & Schindler, W.J. "Certification requirements of general educators concerning exceptional pupils." Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 394-396.
- Stager, S.F. & Young, R.D. "Intergroup contact and social outcomes for mainstreamed EMR adolescents." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1981, 85, 497-503.

- Stephens, T.M. & Braun, B. "Measures of regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children." Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 292-293.
- Thomas, M. A. "Changes in the field of mental retardation: A conversation with Samuel A. Kirk." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1981, 16, 119-124.
- Valett, R.E. "Mainstreaming exceptional children by functional achievement grouping." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, 123, 171.
- Warnock, N.J. "Making general education 'special'." Readings in Mainstreaming, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1977, 56-59.
- Warren, S.E. "What is wrong with mainstreaming? A comment on drastic change." Mental Retardation, 1979, 17, 301-302.
- Weinberg, R.A. & Wood, F.H. (Eds.) Observation of pupils and teachers in mainstream and special education settings: Alternative strategies. Minneapolis: Leadership Training Institute for Special Education, 1975.
- Williams, R.J. & Algozzine, B. "Teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming." Elementary School Journal, 1979, 80, 63-67.

APPENDIX A

Attitudinal Questionnaire

Attitudinal Questionnaire

1. Grade Level Assignment:
1) K-3 2) 4-6 3) 7-9 4) 10-12
2. Sex:
1) Male 2) Female
3. Marital Status:
1) Married 2) Single 3) Separated/Divorced
4. Age:
1) 20-25 2) 26-30 3) 31-40 4) 41-50 5) Over 50
5. Years Teaching Experience:
1) 0-3 2) 4-6 3) 7-10 4) 10-15 5) Over 16
6. Last Degree Obtained:
1) BA/BS 2) MA/MS 3) Ed. S 4) Ed.D/Ph.D
7. Number of Special Ed. Courses/Workshops Taken:
1) None 2) 1-2 3) 3-4 4) 5-6 5) Over 6
8. Do You Have A Handicapped Relative?
1) Yes 2) No

MAKE CERTAIN YOU ARE ON #9 ON THE ANSWER SHEET.

- | | <u>SA A U D SD</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| 9. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for special-needs students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. The needs of handicapped students can best be served through special, separate classes. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- | | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 11. A special-needs child's classroom behavior generally requires more patience from the teacher than does the behavior of a normal child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of the special-needs child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. The extra attention special-needs students require will be to the detriment of the other students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Mainstreaming offers mixed group interaction which will foster understanding and acceptance of differences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains a special-needs child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Regular teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with special-needs students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. The behavior of special-needs students will set a bad example for the other students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of a special-needs student. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. The special-needs child will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | <u>SA A U D SD</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| 20. Most special-needs children do not make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 21. Integration of special-needs children will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 22. Most special-needs children are well-behaved in the classroom. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 23. The contact regular-class students have with mainstreamed students may be harmful. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 24. Regular classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach children with special needs. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25. Special-needs students will monopolize the teacher's time. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26. Mainstreaming the special-needs child will promote his/her social independence. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. It is likely that a special-needs child will exhibit behavior problems in a regular classroom setting. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is better done by resource-room or special teachers than by regular classroom teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. The integration of special-needs students can be beneficial for regular students. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. Special-needs children need to be told exactly what to do and how to do it. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
31. Mainstreaming is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the special-needs child.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Increased freedom in the classroom creates too much confusion.	1	2	3	4	5
33. The special-needs child will be socially isolated by regular classroom students.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Parents of a special-needs child present no greater problem for a classroom teacher than those of a normal child.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Integration of special-needs children will necessitate extensive retraining of regular teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Special-needs students should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom setting, where possible.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Special-needs children are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
38. The presence of special-needs students will promote acceptance of differences on the part of regular students.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B
Directions Sheet

Directions Sheet

1. Only regular classroom teachers are to participate in this survey. This excludes principals, special education teachers, remedial reading/math teachers, librarians, counselors, aides, etc.
2. A number 2 pencil is required for the answer sheet.
3. Do not write on the questionnaire. Mark your answers on the answer sheet. Make a dark mark over the number you select for each of the 38 items. Please answer every question.
4. On items 1-8, mark the number that indicates your answer. Please mark only one answer for each item.
5. On items 9-38, mark the number that indicates your answer. There are no correct answers; the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings.

SA: Strongly Agree
A: Agree
U: Undecided
D: Disagree
SD: Strongly Disagree
6. Be careful not to mark 0 on any item.
7. When you finish, please erase any stray marks on your answer sheet.
8. Make certain your name is marked off the list when you turn in your materials.

VITA

VITA

Paula Lavendar Norton was born in Marion, North Carolina on September 19, 1950 to Paul W. and Lois M. Lavendar. She has one older sister. The daughter of a career army officer, she attended elementary schools in Camp Wood, Japan; Fort Campbell, Kentucky; Baumholder, Germany; and Fort Benning, Georgia. She graduated from Baker High School in Columbus, Georgia in 1968. In 1971 she received a BA degree in English from Columbus College and entered graduate school at Western Carolina University.

On July 15, 1972 she married James Robert Norton. In August 1972 she started her teaching career with the McDowell County School System, where she has continued to teach for nine years.

In 1975 she was awarded a MAEd in special education from Western Carolina University. In 1977 she earned a second master's degree from WCU in educational supervision. She is currently enrolled in the EdS program in special education at Appalachian State University.

Mrs. Norton lives at 401 Woodland Drive in Marion, North Carolina with her husband and their dog, Oscy.